



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W2465/D/21/3271118

66 Romway Road, Leicester LE5 5SB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Issa against the decision of Leicester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20202158, dated 1 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of two-storey extension at side and rear of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as it is more precise than that on the application form. I note that the appellant has used the same description on the appeal form therefore I am satisfied that neither party has been prejudiced.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, and the effect of the development on the living conditions of 64 Romway Road in terms of outlook and loss of light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set on the junction of Romway Road and Romway Avenue. The area is predominately residential in nature.
5. The appeal proposals are for a wrap around extension to the side and the rear of the property. The host dwelling is rendered, unlike the majority of nearby properties which are of traditional brick construction.
6. When seen in the context of nearby properties, the scale, size and massing of the extension proposed would appear incongruous and overwhelming and would be extremely visible in the street scene for Romway Road and Romway Avenue, and longer views in the residential area, due to its strident nature.

7. I find that the design, scale and massing of the appeal proposal would dominate the host dwelling and harm the character and appearance of the area, and would not respect the traditional design ethos of the two-storey dwellings that are prominent in this section of Romsey Road and Romsey Avenue.
8. Concluding on this issue, I find that the proposal would not respect the host dwelling or the character and appearance of the area, and therefore is in conflict with Policy CS03 of the Leicester City Council Core Strategy (2010), the Residential Amenity Supplementary Planning Document (2008) (the SPD) and Paragraph 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which, when taken as a whole, amongst other matters expect development to contribute positively to an area's character and appearance, ensure the shape, size and position of an extension does not dominate the existing house and should take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of an area.

Living Conditions

9. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal, if constructed, would be a more prominent feature than the current relationship between Nos 64 and 66, but the orientation of the rear windows draws the outlook from No 64 to the rear garden and beyond. Therefore, whilst the proposal would result in some additional sense of enclosure to one side, the wider outlook from the rear of No 64 would not be significantly compromised as a result of the development.
10. I consider that an additional sense of enclosure would be very localised, and not have significant implications for the residents of No 64 with regard to the enjoyment and use of the wider garden area.
11. I conclude that on this issue, the proposals would not lead to a significant loss of outlook for the adjacent residents, and with regard to this issue the proposal is therefore consistent with Policy PS10 of the City of Leicester Local Plan (2006), the SPD and Paragraph 127 of the Framework, which amongst other matters, expects development to respect adjacent properties privacy. Nonetheless, this does not outweigh the harm that I have previously identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR